



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/553,962	10/04/2006	Ludvig Karlsson	1515-1040	1001
<div>465 7590 07/09/2008</div> <div>YOUNG & THOMPSON 209 Madison Street Suite 500 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314</div>			<div>EXAMINER</div> <div>MA, TZE</div> <div>ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER</div> <div>2628</div> <div>MAIL DATE DELIVERY MODE</div> <div>07/09/2008 PAPER</div>	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary**Application No.**

10/553,962

Applicant(s)

KARLSSON ET AL.

Examiner

TIZE MA

Art Unit

2628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-10 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 11-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SE/US)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

3. Claims 11-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wattenberg (US. 6,583,794 B1), and in view of Purplemath-Ratio (NPL: Purplemath -- Your Algebra Resource Ratio & Proportion, 10/01/2002:

<http://web.archive.org/web/20021001163811/www.purplemath.com/modules/ratio.htm>, hereinafter as Purplemath-Ratio).

4. Regarding claim 11, the applicant admits that " In a method for displaying parameters of a set of companies that have been tree-mapped into plural levels wherein the companies are nodes at one level of the tree-map and nodes at subsequent levels

Art Unit: 2628

up the tree-map from the one level are groups of companies sorted by predetermined characteristics, wherein the method includes displaying a frame that has a shape of a first geometrical figure and has plural second geometrical figures within the frame, showing relative values of a first parameter of the companies at selected tree-map levels as relative sizes of the second geometrical figures within the frame and showing relative values of a second parameter of the companies at the selected tree-map levels as different colors of the second geometrical figures within the frame" is prior art. It is stated in the lines 4-5 on page 7 of the specification. In addition, Wattenberg also teaches all these features (column 3, lines 1-20, lines 34-40; column 4, lines 25-47. Stock market is divided into sectors. Each sector comprises a number of companies. The whole market is visualized as a rectangle. The rectangle is divided in to smaller rectangles, which represent sectors. Each rectangle which represents a sector is further divided into even smaller rectangles to represent companies. The sizes and colors of the rectangles convey information about the sectors and companies, e.g., market caps, volumes, or price changes).

5. The applicant claims the improvement wherein the method further comprises the steps of:

when a change in the first parameter occurs at one of the nodes of the tree-map, recalculating values of the first parameter for ancestors of the one node at each level in a direction up the tree-map starting at the one node until a highest tree-map level is reached without recalculating values of the first parameter for nodes other than the one node and ancestors of the one node;

completely filling the frame with the second geometrical figures by reapportioning the relative sizes of the second geometrical shapes of nodes other than the one node and ancestors of the one node based on the recalculated value of the first parameter of the one node and of ancestors of the one node; and

displaying the frame with revised relative sizes of the second geometrical figures at selected levels of the tree-map to a user of information conveyed by the first and second parameters.

6. The improvement is a process of re-displaying the tree map when there is a change in a parameter of a rectangle, e.g., a market cap change of a company. In order to analyze the difference between Wattenberg and the instant claim, it is useful to demonstrate what operations would be the most obvious and natural according to Wattenberg when such change occurs. It is described as following using the stock market scenario. Assume that company D which is in the sector A has a change in its market cap, and the rest of the market remains unchanged. As the size of rectangle representing D would be changed, according to Wattenberg, all rectangles which represent the sectors and companies would have to be re-sized and re-drawn since the size of each rectangle is determined by its weight relative to the weight of total market (column 4, lines 25-47). However, Wattenberg does not explicitly teach the calculation. With the help of Purplemath-Ratio, the relative weight of a company or a sector to the entire market can be expressed as a ratio of the market cap of the company or the sector to the market cap of the entire market, which is $m/(m+n) \times X$ (See lines 36-37, geese in birds). When applied to the above scenario, where m would be the market cap

(first parameter) of D, n would be the market cap of rest of the market, X would be the total area of the root rectangle. $m+n$ can be rewritten as $P_a + P_b + P_c$, assuming there are 3 sectors and P_a , P_b , P_c are the market caps of the sectors. Since P_b and P_c remain unchanged, there is no need to re-calculate them. Only P_a and $P_a+P_b+P_c$ need to be re-calculated. This is exactly the first of the instant claim. Then the above ratio corresponding each company and sector is calculated, the size of every rectangle is obtained. This is exactly the second step of the instant claim. Then the entire tree map is re-drawn, which is the third step of the instant claim.

7. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the method as shown in Wattenberg according to Purplemath-Ratio by only calculating the quantities which have changed due to the change of one of the parameters of a node, and calculating the ratios which determine the sizes of the rectangles if such a change occurs for the benefit of minimizing the required computation.

8. Regarding claim 12, Wattenberg teaches wherein the first and second parameters are selected from the group of parameters consisting of a value of a company, a fraction of a trading volume, and a change of share price (column 3, lines 55-59).

9. Regarding claim 13, Wattenberg teaches wherein the displaying step includes displaying relative values of companies or groups of companies as the relative sizes of the second geometrical figures and displaying a change of share price of the companies or groups of companies as colors of the respective second geometrical figures (column

3, lines 1-20; column 4, lines 37-40; companies, sectors, determining physical size of each display sector).

10. Regarding claim 14, Wattenberg teaches further comprising the step of visualizing sizes and share price changes of companies and groups of companies on a stock exchange based on the information conveyed within the displayed frames at different tree-map levels (column 3, lines 34-45; sizes and colors of the regions convey financial info).

11. Regarding claim 15, Wattenberg teaches wherein the first and second geometrical figures are rectangles or squares (column 3, line 2, rectangles).

12. Regarding claim 16, Wattenberg teaches further comprising the step of revising the colors of the second geometrical figures following the step of completely filling the frame and before displaying the frame (Fig. 9; column 16, lines 16-23. Wattenberg provides a facility of manipulating color anytime. Such a manipulation can be done after any change and before re-display the frame).

13. Claims 17-18 are rejected based on the same rationale as to claims 11 and 15-16 since claims 17-18 are the re-combinations of the limitations in claims 11 and 15-16 and the limitations are individually addressed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TIZE MA whose telephone number is (571)270-3709. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 7:30-5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xiao M. Wu can be reached on 571-272-7761. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tm

/XIAO M. WU/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2628